

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44*bis*)

Applicant's or agent's file reference IGT1P294.WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2007/077714	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 06 September 2007 (06.09.2007)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 08 September 2006 (08.09.2006)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant IGT		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.																								
In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																									
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 60%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44 <i>bis</i> .3(c) and 93 <i>bis</i> .1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Date of issuance of this report 10 March 2009 (10.03.2009)</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Authorized officer</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">Ellen Moyse</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">e-mail: pt02.pct@wipo.int</td> </tr> </table>	Date of issuance of this report 10 March 2009 (10.03.2009)	Authorized officer		Ellen Moyse	e-mail: pt02.pct@wipo.int	
Date of issuance of this report 10 March 2009 (10.03.2009)	Authorized officer						
	Ellen Moyse						
e-mail: pt02.pct@wipo.int							

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US2007/077714

International filing date (day/month/year)
06.09.2007

Priority date (day/month/year)
08.09.2006

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
INV. G07F17/32

Applicant
IGT

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Date of completion of
this opinion

see form
PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

Lavin Liermo, Jesus

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2289



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2007/077714

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2. ☐ This opinion has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
4. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2007/077714

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-67</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-67</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-67</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : WO-A-02101486

D2 : WO-A-03027970

- 2 Claims 1, 54, 64, 65 (network claims); and claims 20, 61 (method claims) do not fulfil the requirements of Art. 6 PCT.

Although claims 1, 54, 64, 65 (network claims); and claims 20, 61 (method claims) have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought and in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

A complete substantive examination was nevertheless performed for the purpose of speeding up the prosecution on this file.

- 3 Claim 1 does not fulfil the requirements of Art. 54(1),(2) EPC.

D1 discloses a mobile gaming network (see either figure 1 or figure 2) comprising: a wager gaming zone having a first plurality of transmitters (see figure 2 "Cell ID", "GPS", page 11 lines 11-15 all the listed standards require several transmitters), wherein a mobile gaming device (102) (page 11 lines 10-11) can be used to play a wagering game (steps 320-334); a non-wager gaming zone wherein a mobile gaming device cannot be used to play a wagering game (page 4 lines 14-21 "The mobile gaming unit may be further ...or deactivated according to local gaming restrictions") (page 12 lines 29-35); and a mobile gaming server (204, 206, 208) storing data relating to one or more mobile

gaming device users, one or more mobile gaming devices, and to relationships among the one or more users, the one or more devices, and the wager gaming zone and the non-wager gaming zone (page 11 lines 17-33 "Home gaming register....similar description and operation of database 116.....and/or countries").

Claim 1 is therefore not novel (Art. 54(1),(2) EPC).

Similar considerations apply to claims 54, 64, 65; and claims 20, 61. Thus none of said claims is novel (Art. 54(1),(2) EPC).

- 4 D1 page 6 line 25 "RF" discloses the supplementary features of claim 3.

D1 page 11 lines 27-28, page 13 lines 13-25 anticipates the supplementary features of claim 10.

None of the further features of the dependent claims seem to serve as basis for an allowable independent claim because said features relate to either rules of playing games or to well-known technical features.

- 5 Apart from the arguments provided above, the examiner wants to make a clarification on the feature of claim 20 "disabling operability.....of the mobile device" (see page 66 lines 33-35). Said feature represents the standard operation of a GSM mobile phone, because if the communication between the base station and the mobile phone is cut, the mobile phone is out of order (the user sees the message "Network Search"). This feature represents the well-known concept in communications network of "sliding window", that means if a packet or message is not confirmed within a predetermined time, the devices communicating interpret that the communication is cut or broken.
- 6 The applicant is informed that starting from D2 (claims 1, 30, 48, page 13 lines 20-35, page 33 lines 5-11) claims 1, 20, 54, 61, 64, 65 do not fulfil the requirements of Art. 54(1),(2) EPC.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/US2007/077714
